

I am deeply concerned to see a media giant dictating the presentation of election-related materials on their airwaves. Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation. I have no objection to any number of stations choosing to run this or any other documentary. At issue is the command from a partisan network owner to literally define what his stations can call news or not.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. They can run partisan materials, following the rules governing electioneering. And local stations can run both local and network news. In this case, however, the network is clearly using the cover of "news broadcasting" to get around regulations on electioneering.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.